

# **Report of the Accreditation Re-Visit to San Diego Christian College March 15-17, 2011**

## **Overview:**

This item is the accreditation team report for the March 15-17, 2011 revisit to San Diego Christian College. The initial visit took place in April of 2010. This item provides the report of the re-visit team as well as recommendations regarding four stipulations and the accreditation status.

## **Recommendations**

1. That the five stipulations from the 2010 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** to **Accreditation**.

## **Background**

A COA accreditation team conducted a site visit at San Diego Christian College on April 11-14, 2010. On the basis of the accreditation team report last year, the COA made the following accreditation decision for San Diego Christian College and all of its credential programs: **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**

The institution was required to respond to the stipulations and prepare for a re-visit within one year of the accreditation action. The institution prepared a document with referenced supporting evidence indicating how each of the stipulations had been addressed and what changes had been made in areas of the standards identified by the team as needing attention. The institution prepared an interview schedule for the constituencies identified by the team. The re-visit was conducted by an experienced team leader and a CTC staff consultant. After the interviews on campus, the Team Leader prepared an accreditation report that was presented to the institution. It is now provided to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration and action. Following are the stipulations from the original accreditation visit and the Re-visit team's recommendations:

<b>2010 Stipulations</b>	<b>Revisit Team Recommendations</b>
1. That the institution fully integrate the instruction of content specific pedagogy as defined by state-adopted academic content standards and curriculum frameworks into coursework and fieldwork.	Removal of Stipulation
2. The institution must organize, implement, and document regular, formal training for college and district employed supervisors to ensure they can support and evaluate candidates' abilities during fieldwork in light of the knowledge and skills being taught in the college coursework	Removal of Stipulation
3. The institution must create and implement a collaborative partnership that includes several district-employed personnel to systematically engage in substantive dialog related to quality and	Removal of Stipulation

2010 Stipulations	Revisit Team Recommendations
effectiveness of the design and the implementation of SDCC candidate preparation.	
4. The institution must continue to implement and refine its assessment and evaluation system to ensure that data are systematically aggregated, analyzed, and utilized for ongoing program and unit evaluation.	Removal of Stipulation
5. The institution is required to notify all candidates in the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs, by letter, of the current accreditation status of the college.	Removal of Stipulation

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
Committee on Accreditation  
Re-Visit Team Report**

**Institution:** San Diego Christian College

**Credential Programs:** Multiple Subject Preliminary Teacher Preparation  
Single Subject Preliminary Teacher Preparation

**Dates of Re-visit:** March 15-17, 2011

**Accreditation Team Recommendation:**

1. That the five stipulations from the 2010 accreditation visit be removed.
2. The accreditation decision be changed from Accreditation with Major Stipulations to **Accreditation.**

**Rationale:**

The institution has made remarkable progress this past year in addressing each of the stipulations and making substantive changes in the program. The institution prepared a narrative report that outlined steps taken to address each of the stipulations. The report included appropriate supporting evidence for each part of the narrative. In the course of the response to the stipulations and the supporting evidence, all of the Common Standards and Program Standards were also addressed. After examining the written documentation and conducting interviews at the campus, the re-visit team is recommending that each of the stipulations be removed. Further, in the course of providing responses to the stipulations, the institution also responded to the Common Standards and the Program Standards. The team determined that each of the standards less than fully met a year ago are now **Met**. There were four noteworthy things that the institution accomplished in the process of responding to the stipulations.

1. The institution reformulated its advisory committee to expand the scope of its advice and to provide closer connection with the K-12 schools.
2. The institution developed a special 50 hour individualized subject specific pedagogy tutorial for its single subject credential program.
3. The institution instituted a formalized supervisor training program, first for the college field supervisors and then for the district-employed field supervisors.
4. The institution has instituted an annual faculty workshop focused on the state student content standards and how they are implemented in the schools and embedded in the teacher preparation program.

### Standards Less than Fully Met at the 2010 Site Visit and the Re-Visit Team Finding

Common Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1. Educational Leadership	X		
2. Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation	X		
3. Faculty and Instructional Personnel	X		
1. Field Experience and Clinical Practice	X		
2. District Employed Supervisors	X		
3. Assessment of Candidate Competence	X		

Multiple and Single Subject Preliminary Program Standards	Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
1. Program Design	X		
2. Collaboration in Governing the Program	X		
3. Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice	X		
7a. Preparation to Teach Multiple Subject Reading-Language Arts	X		
7b. Preparation to Teach Single Subject Reading-Language Arts	X		
13. Preparation to Teach English Learners	X		
14. Preparation to Teach Special Populations	X		
15. Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork	X		
16. Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications. of Field Supervisors	X		
8a. Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction – Multiple Subject	X		
8b' Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction – Single Subject	X		

**Staff further recommends that:**

- San Diego Christian College be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- San Diego Christian College continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

#### Accreditation Team

**Re-Visit Team Leader:**

**Caryl Hodges**  
University of San Francisco

**Staff to the Visit:**

**Larry Birch**  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing

### Documents Reviewed

Revisit Report	Multiple/Single Subject Program
Biennial Report	Standards
Common Standards Report	Candidate Handbook
Course Syllabi	Assessment Committee Minutes
Fieldwork Handbooks	Education Committee Minutes
Faculty Vitae	Program Advisory Committee Minutes
SDCC website	

Interviews Conducted	TOTAL
Program Faculty	4
Institutional Administration	1
Student Teachers	17
Subject Specific Specialists	3
Employers of Graduates	1
District-Employed Supervisors	4
College Supervisors	3
Student Teaching Placement Coordinator	2
Education Advisory Committee	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>41</b>

### Background information

San Diego Christian College was founded in 1970 as Christian Heritage College by Drs. Tim LaHaye, Art Peters, and Henry Morris, who desired to equip students through an education that trains both mind and heart. The first degrees were awarded in 1973. Soon after, the college moved campuses and now shares a 32 acre complex with Shadow Mountain Community Church. The College is a small residential liberal arts institution located east of San Diego.

In 1976 Christian Heritage College was awarded the status of Candidate for Accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and was given full Accreditation in 1984. The last WASC site visit occurred in April, 2008, when accreditation was extended to 2016. The college is also a member of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU).

Current college enrollment is 421 students who are enrolled in either the traditional undergraduate track or the adult non-traditional track—Adult Professional Studies (APS). (The Teacher Credential Program operates under the Adult Professional Studies division of the College.) SDCC has students from 29 different states and 14 countries. Men comprise 56% of the student body and women 44%. Approximately 50% are resident students, and 50% are commuters. The student/faculty ratio is 14:1. The demographics of the student body break down as follows:

American Indian/Alaskan Native—2%  
Asian/Pacific Islander—3%  
Black/Non-Hispanic—10%  
Hispanic—19%

White/Non-Hispanic—48%  
Non-Resident Alien—2%  
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander <1%  
Race/ethnicity unreported—14%

The college offers Bachelor's degrees in fifteen different majors including Aviation, History, Music, Bible, Psychology, Biology and Liberal Studies. SDCC offers many opportunities in the area of sports, including baseball, basketball, cross-country, soccer and volleyball. SDCC is a member of the NAIA Division I, and GSAC (Golden State Athletic Conference).

### Teacher Education Program

The overall mission of the Education Department is to equip committed men and women to become effective educators who model Christ-like character. Further, the purpose of the Department of Education is to provide courses that lead to California State Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials and Association of Christian Schools International Teaching Certificates. The overriding goal of the Department is to nurture and develop highly qualified Christian teachers who have an appropriate subject-matter foundation, upon which has been built an understanding of student behavior, competence in teaching abilities, the ability to develop and encourage critical judgment and creativity, and a commitment to high ethical standards and Christian service.

The work of the Education Department is to administer the Liberal Studies major (undergraduate) and the Teacher Credential Program (TCP) which offers the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential. The TCP is administered as a post-graduate program, requiring that all candidates have a bachelors' degree before completing the two-semester program. Looking back over the last five years reveals that approximately 46% of the candidates came from institutions other than SDCC.

Currently, the department chair is an interim position. The college hopes to soon launch a master's program, and at that time, a faculty member holding a terminal degree will be sought for the position. There are currently two full-time faculty in the department, both holding masters degrees.

The TCP is a small program, with the MS and SS managed as a combined program. MS and SS share some coursework and take separate courses for level-specific training. Demographics from the last five years show that the average number of program completers per year was 21. Of those, 16% were male, and 84% were female. Multiple Subject credentials accounted for 75% of the credentials earned, while 25% were Single Subject with the greatest number in English and SS/History.

The TCP generally runs two cohorts each academic year; one cohort begins in late August and completes the required coursework along with student teaching the following May or June, depending on the student teaching placement. The second cohort begins in January and finishes in December of the same year. Candidates complete 40 hours of fieldwork during the first semester of the program, and full-time student teaching during the second semester with a concurrent seminar. During the undergraduate experience, students who earn degrees from

SDCC typically complete 40-50 hours of fieldwork. Forty hours of fieldwork is required during the TCP program.

At present, there is a single site from which all coursework is offered. The TCP is staffed by two full-time faculty members and about four adjunct faculty.

San Diego Christian College is a small institution situated in the San Diego suburb of El Cajon. The college offers both the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teacher Credentials through the Teacher Credential Program (TCP). These are run as a single program with separate courses as appropriate. The course of study is a two-semester, post-graduate program (Block 2—method courses and fieldwork & Block 3—student teaching). Candidates come into the program through SDCC's undergraduate majors and from other institutions. Those who complete their Bachelor's degree at the college fulfill all prerequisite work (Block 1, prerequisites) in their undergraduate studies. Post-graduate candidates complete the prerequisites they have not yet fulfilled before or during Block 2 (method courses and fieldwork). Being a small school, the program is administered through the SDCC's Department of Education as opposed to a SOE.

In April 2010, the Teacher Credential Program underwent a site visit as part of the regular CCTC accreditation process. A determination of "Accreditation with Major Stipulations" was recommended by the Site Visit Team. On May 20, 2010 program representatives met with the COA who approved the Site Visit's team determination and added a further designation of a letter informing current TCP candidates of the program's status. They also merged Stipulation 2 (College Supervisor training) with Stipulation 3 (district-employed supervisor training) into one stipulation. Since then, the TCP has been working to address these four stipulations. The mandated letter to all enrolled candidates was issued on July 2, 2010.

Faculty and staff involved in the Teacher Credential Program crafted a plan to meet each of the stipulations in a complete and satisfactory manner. The planning process began before the meeting in Sacramento with the COA and has been added to, revised, and expanded as program personnel worked through the complex process of implementation. The process can be tracked through the Education Faculty meeting minutes and Progress Reports. Perusal of this material gives a clear outline of the progress and development which has resulted in the current report.

The stipulations are multi-faceted and so affect each block of the TCP. Therefore each block has been planned for, implemented, then evaluated for effectiveness. Block 1 (prerequisites) changes were implemented in the summer (July and August, 2010). Block 2 (August 25 - Dec. 15, 2010) changes were implemented throughout the semester within each of the two 8-week sections. Block 3 began on Jan 10th and by the time of the revisit (March 15-17) the Block was at the mid-point. During this academic year, the program had run just one cohort beginning in the summer of 2010.

## Stipulations

### Stipulation 1:

*That the institution fully integrate the instruction of content specific pedagogy as defined by state-adopted academic content standards and curriculum frameworks into coursework and fieldwork.*

### 2011 San Diego Christian College Response

The institution prepared a document with a narrative responding to each of the stipulations and links to supporting evidence. In the narrative, the institution made reference to Common Standards and Program Standards that were appropriate to the particular stipulation and described what had been accomplished at the institution to meet each standard not fully met at the original site visit. This narrative description also included links to supporting evidence. Interviews were also conducted to provide further supporting evidence.

### 2011 Re-visit Team Findings

The re-visit team found ample evidence that the program is fully integrating the preparation of candidates to teach the academic content standards and curriculum frameworks throughout coursework and field work. This is addressed in the re-visit team findings related to Common Standard 1-Leadership, Common Standard 4-Faculty, Common Standard 7-Field Experience, Common Standard 9-Assessment of Candidates, Program Standard 1-Program Design, Program Standard 4-Pedagogical and Reflective Practice, Program Standards 7a and 7b-Teaching of Reading, Program Standard 13-Preparation to Teach English Learners, Program Standard 14-Preparation to Teach Special Populations, and Program Standards 8a and 8b-Preparation for Subject Specific Pedagogy. Throughout the evidence gathered in relation to these standards it was clear that the program makes consistent efforts to ensure that the state-adopted academic content standards are a vital part of the preparation program. In addition, the institution has instituted a yearly workshop for faculty to keep them updated on the latest information about the standards and how they should be integrated into the program.

### 2011 Re-Visit Team Recommendation

On the basis of review of the written and interview evidence related to the stipulation and the standards appropriate to the stipulation, the team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### Stipulation 2:

*The institution must organize, implement, and document regular, formal training for college and district employed supervisors to ensure they can support and evaluate candidates' abilities during fieldwork in light of the knowledge and skills being taught in the college coursework*

### 2011 San Diego Christian College Response

The institution prepared a document with a narrative responding to each of the stipulations and links to supporting evidence. In the narrative, the institution made reference to Common Standards and Program Standards that were appropriate to the particular stipulation and described what had been accomplished at the institution to meet each standard not fully met at



the original site visit. This narrative description also included links to supporting evidence. Interviews were also conducted to provide further supporting evidence.

### **2011 Re-visit Team Findings**

In addition to the current informal training program, the institution began a new formal training program for both college supervisors and district-employed supervisors on how to support and evaluate the teacher candidates in field experiences. At the beginning of each period of student teaching placement, a meeting is held for college supervisors, cooperating teachers and student teachers to review the expectations for supervision of candidates. In the event that a cooperating teacher is not able to attend, the college supervisor is responsible for scheduling a training session with the cooperating teacher to ensure appropriate training. Further information about this is in the discussion about Common Standards 7 and 8.

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Recommendation**

On the basis of review of the written and interview evidence related to the stipulation and the standards appropriate to the stipulation, the team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

### **Stipulation 3:**

*The institution must create and implement a collaborative partnership that includes several district-employed personnel to systematically engage in substantive dialog related to quality and effectiveness of the design and the implementation of SDCC candidate preparation.*

### **2011 San Diego Christian College Response**

The institution prepared a document with a narrative responding to each of the stipulations and links to supporting evidence. In the narrative, the institution made reference to Common Standards and Program Standards that were appropriate to the particular stipulation and described what had been accomplished at the institution to meet each standard not fully met at the original site visit. This narrative description also included links to supporting evidence. Interviews were also conducted to provide further supporting evidence.

### **2011 Re-visit Team Findings**

The college has reconstituted its advisory committee to develop a much more active group that includes more representatives of cooperating districts. The topics of the meetings are focused on critical issues about the substance and operation of the program. Information about this committee and its operation was in the revised narrative for Common Standards 1 and 2, and Program Standard 2.

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Recommendation**

On the basis of review of the written and interview evidence related to the stipulation and the standards appropriate to the stipulation, the team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

**Stipulation 4:**

*The institution must continue to implement and refine its assessment and evaluation system to ensure that data are systematically aggregated, analyzed, and utilized for ongoing program and unit evaluation.*

**2011 San Diego Christian College Response**

The institution prepared a document with a narrative responding to each of the stipulations and links to supporting evidence. In the narrative, the institution made reference to Common Standards and Program Standards that were appropriate to the particular stipulation and described what had been accomplished at the institution to meet each standard not fully met at the original site visit. This narrative description also included links to supporting evidence. Interviews were also conducted to provide further supporting evidence.

**2011 Re-visit Team Findings**

The institution has implemented a systematic process to collect, analyze and use data for program improvement. This includes involvement of the community advisory committee as well as the faculty and administration. Discussion was found in the narrative for Common Standard 2.

**2011 Re-Visit Team Recommendation**

On the basis of review of the written and interview evidence related to the stipulation and the standards appropriate to the stipulation, the team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

**Stipulation 5:**

*The institution is required to notify all candidates in the Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs, by letter, of the current accreditation status of the College.*

**2011 San Diego Christian College Response**

The institution prepared a letter to all candidates that was reviewed by CTC staff before sending it. The letter was sent as directed by the Committee on Accreditation.

**2011 Re-visit Team Findings**

The team verified that the letter was sent.

**2011 Re-Visit Team Recommendation**

On the basis of the sending of the required letter, the team recommends that the stipulation be removed.

# Common Standards

## Standard 1: Educational Leadership

The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

### 2010 Team Findings

### 2010 Team Decision: Met with Concerns

*There was inconsistent evidence that the vision of the program is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. While there was limited evidence in some course syllabi that the program presents information about the state academic content standards, the preponderance of evidence from course documents and interviews with faculty indicated that the program is not unified by a shared vision of the role that the state academic content standards and curriculum frameworks should play in preparing and assessing future educators.*

*The team identified another area of concern regarding the program's governance structure. Interviews with faculty and instructional personnel revealed that these individuals meet regularly to organize, coordinate, and govern the educator preparation program. However, the review of advisory council minutes and interviews with relevant stakeholders revealed that advisory board agendas provided little time or opportunity for gathering input from non-SDCC stakeholders related to proposed direction of programs, courses, teaching, or candidate performance and experiences.*

### 2011 Re-Visit Team Findings

A review of evidence, including syllabi, handbooks, and interviews with faculty, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and candidates indicated that the California adopted standards and frameworks are integrated across the program and form the foundation for instruction. Candidates indicate a strong emphasis is placed on the content standards which is supported by interviews with cooperating teachers indicating candidates were both knowledgeable and well prepared to teach using adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The implementation of an annual faculty workshop focused on connecting state content standards in the preparation program with the implementation of these standards in P12 classrooms indicates the program's understanding of the role content standards and curriculum frameworks play in preparing and assessing future educators.

The review of meeting minutes and interviews with Advisory Committee members indicate that a previous ad hoc advisory committee which reviewed and provided feedback on data (e.g.

biennial report) to the department every 2 years. A restructured Advisory Committee was formed and currently meets twice a year. The role and responsibilities of the committee have been more clearly defined and their scope of involvement in program review and development/improvement has been expanded. The current Advisory Committee consists of a range of stakeholders including district and school administrators and staff and classroom teachers from districts and schools in which SDCC places candidates for observations and field experience placements. A clear statement of the charge to the Advisory Committee was developed. Individuals invited to be members were provided with a clear statement of the purposed of the committee and the expectations of their role as a member of the group. Interviews with Advisory Committee members indicate their involvement in reviewing program design, candidate and program assessment data, and issues identified by stakeholders for discussion as reflected in the committee minutes. Minutes, as well as information shared in interviews with committee members, indicate discussions in recent meetings included placements and support for district-employed supervisors (cooperating teachers and subject specific specialist) and the development of the subject specific experience for single subject credential candidates. The Advisory Committee members indicated that recommendation and decisions made by the group have been implemented by the program.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

## **Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**

The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program completer performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.

### **2010 Team Findings**

### **2010 Team Decision: Met with Concerns**

*A review of program documents revealed that, although data are collected by multiple sources such as faculty, college supervisors and cooperating teachers for individual candidate assessment, the data are not systematically aggregated, analyzed, or utilized for ongoing program or unit evaluation.*

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Findings**

For all practical purposes the program and unit are the same entity. A review of program documents, including the TCP Assessment Calendar, and interviews with the Academic Vice President, Department Chair, and faculty indicate that a range of assessment data is collected across the program, then aggregated and reviewed by several groups for program evaluation and improvement. At their meeting in June, the Advisory Committee receives data for the year for review, discussion, and feedback for program improvement. The Advisory Committee makes recommendation for program changes which, based on interviews with committee members, have been implemented. Faculty meet during the summer to review candidate data from course

assessments, field placement evaluations, and tests (TPA, RICA) to make informed decisions for course and program improvement. The Academic Vice President receives all this information and is able to make decisions about the program. Prior to this academic year, the data from the Teacher Credential Program had been reported routinely (Biennial Report, yearly aggregated data, etc.) but in a less formal process.

In addition, the Academic Vice President indicated that the college has a capstone review process for all program. The Academic Vice President indicated that, based on the accreditation report, the TCP would be given a point in time in the annual college program review cycle.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

#### **Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**

Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation.

#### **2010 Team Findings**

#### **2010 Team Decision: Met with Concerns**

*While core faculty are assigned to courses based on their professional expertise and educational background, some adjunct faculty, full-time faculty from other departments, and college supervisors teach courses for which they have limited formal training, understanding about the context of public schooling, or the ability to model best professional practices as they relate to teaching and learning in California's K-12 classrooms. Similarly, these non-core faculty members and college supervisors had a cursory understanding of the curriculum frameworks or the accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. All faculty interviewed were committed to the institution's mission of Christian service.*

*A comprehensive review of program documents and interviews with faculty revealed that the core faculty members intentionally teach and model general pedagogical skills and multiple instructional strategies related to the Teaching Performance Expectations. However, there was little to no evidence that the SDCC core faculty was working regularly or systematically with area k-12 faculty to ensure that the strategies they teach reflect the best professional practices in teaching and learning being implemented in the local school districts.*

*A review of faculty and adjunct vitae found little evidence of current scholarly work. Some faculty had presented work at professional conferences; however, there was little evidence of publications. Many of the faculty members are actively involved in service through their churches and regularly attend BTSA collaborative and CTC training.*

*The faculty members are not reflective of a diverse society but have created class assignments that introduce candidates to other cultures and languages. The team did not see evidence of any reading, discussion, or assignments dealing with gender diversity.*

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Findings**

The team reviewed faculty assignments with the program chair and further reviewed faculty curriculum vitae. All faculty members teaching courses in the multiple and single subject professional preparation program are appropriately qualified for the courses they teach. They have academic background that is consistent with the courses they teach. Further, they all have experience teaching and/or supervision in the K-12 schools. They are familiar with the issues facing public schooling today, as well as the curriculum and student content standards being used in California's K-12 classrooms. The team at the review last year may have interviewed some faculty members who were teaching in the undergraduate program in Liberal Studies and included them in the findings for the credential program review.

The team also reviewed the involvement of the core faculty members with area K-12 educators and found varied evidences of involvement with K-12 educators. In addition to full time faculty involvement with public schools, some of the core faculty are, in fact, K-12 educators involved in K-12 teaching and/or BTSA support. The team this year found nothing to indicate that core faculty are not strongly involved in the K-12 schools. Again, the finding of the team last year may have reflected a misunderstanding of who were core faculty in the professional preparation program.

The program implemented an annual faculty workshop for faculty and college supervisors as a means of ongoing professional development and to address programmatic issues related to teacher preparation and instruction in P12 classrooms. The faculty workshop in August 2010 focused on connecting state academic content standards and frameworks in the preparation program with the implementation of these standards in P12 classrooms. Program documents and interviews with faculty indicate the program's understanding of the role of content standards and curriculum frameworks in preparing and assessing future educators. The workshop agenda, as well as interviews, indicated the workshop included training on the state academic content standards and frameworks and the review of program revisions to field work, signature assignments, rubrics and benchmarks.

A separate additional training was also implemented for college supervisors. The agenda from the training in addition to interviews with college supervisors indicated a review of state academic content standards and frameworks, college supervisor roles and responsibilities, discussion of the Teaching Performance Expectations, review of handbooks, use of evaluations and rubrics, effective interaction with candidates, and interaction/training responsibilities with cooperating teachers.

The team reviewed the institutional policies for professional development and scholarly contributions within disciplines of the faculty members. Full time faculty members are expected to make professional contributions. Varied activities may include, in addition to formal research and publication, presentations at professional conferences, work with public and private schools, curriculum development, and preparation of accreditation documents. The team found ample evidence that faculty members were making professional contributions both meeting institutional expectations and the Commission standards. Both the review of syllabi and discussion with faculty and students verified that instruction about gender diversity was a part of the program.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

### **Standard 7 – Field Experience and Clinical Practice**

The unit and its partners design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.

#### **2010 Team Findings**

#### **2010 Team Decision: Met with Concerns**

*There is inconsistent evidence that candidates are being taught in coursework, or are required to demonstrate in fieldwork, the knowledge and skills necessary to support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet the state-adopted academic standards.*

*A review of fieldwork documents and interviews with district-employed supervisors provided cursory evidence that the program creates a clear connection between course content and student teaching experiences that candidates need in order to practice and learn the specific research-based strategies necessary for improving student learning.*

#### **2011 Re-Visit Team Findings**

Review of syllabi and interviews with faculty, cooperating teachers, and subject specific specialist indicate that candidates are taught in coursework and required to demonstrate in field work the knowledge and skills needed to support all P12 students in meeting state adopted academic standards. Course assignments, particularly signature assignments, require candidates to plan and then deliver content instruction in their fieldwork placements, grounded in state adopted academic standards.

Interviews with candidates indicate that faculty model and engage candidates in a range of research-based pedagogical instructional strategies in credential courses that candidates then

apply in their field placements. Comments indicate candidates find this method very useful in terms of challenging them to see different ways of teaching academic content to reach the full range of students. Field work documents and interviews with cooperating teachers indicate candidates are well prepared to select and use research-based strategies to teach the diverse students in their P12 classrooms. Interviews with cooperating teachers and college supervisors indicated that participation in the Student Teaching Orientation at the beginning of the semester provided a review of program content and Teaching Performance Expectations, the role of state adopted content standards, and an orientation/training for their role in the student teaching process.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

### **Standard 8 – District Employed Supervisors**

District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.

#### **2010 Team Findings**

#### **2010 Team Decision: Met with Concerns**

*SDCC's written response to this standard described a training or orientation process which was verified by the Lead Placement Supervisor. However, a comprehensive, triangulated, review of program practices failed to substantiate this claim. The team learned that district-employed supervisors received an orientation to their supervisory role that is little more than an explanation of SDCC forms. Additionally, the team could find no consistent evidence that district-employed supervisors are trained in supervision.*

#### **2011 Re-Visit Team Findings**

Review of handbooks and interviews with the Department Chair, college supervisors, and district-employed supervisors (cooperating teachers) indicated the implementation of a more formal training and orientation process initiated in Fall 2010. In addition to updating the handbooks, college supervisors and district-employed supervisors are invited to the student teaching orientation at the beginning each semester. The orientation included a detailed review of: SDCC program design; handbooks and forms, including assessments; roles and responsibilities; and contact information for each individual involved in the student teaching process - candidate, cooperating teacher, college supervisor, and SDCC personnel. Some of this orientation was done jointly followed by individual orientations for each group, providing district-employed supervisors with training specific to their role as a mentor/supervisor for student teachers. District-employed supervisors (cooperating teachers) who are unable to attend the orientation, the college supervisor is responsible for scheduling a orientation/training session with the cooperating teacher. Based on an Advisory Committee recommendation, the program has increased the stipend provided to cooperating teachers and subject specific specialist to \$200.



After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

### **Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**

Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards.

#### **2010 Team Findings**

#### **2010 Team Decision: Met with Concerns**

*There was inadequate and inconsistent evidence that candidates demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills required to effectively educate and support all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards*

#### **2011 Re-Visit Team Findings**

Review of program documents (TCP Assessment Calendar, syllabi, field placement forms, teaching performance data and other assessment data) as well as interviews with the faculty, cooperating teachers, college supervisors, and candidates indicate a range of formative and summative assessment throughout the program are used to assess candidate competence to educate and effectively support all P12 students in meeting state-adopted academic standards. Interviews with cooperating teachers indicate SDCC student teachers knowledgeable in their academic content area(s), have a solid understanding of the P12 academic content standards and curriculum, and are well prepared to teach all students when entering their student teaching placements.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

## Multiple and Single Subject Preliminary Preparation Programs

### 2010 Team Findings - Standards Met With Concerns

#### **Program Standard #1 – Program Design**

*A lack of content specific pedagogical instruction and limited training of field supervisors resulted in inconsistent evidence that the program provides “extensive opportunities for candidates to... use state-adopted instructional materials; and to assess student progress and to apply these understandings in the teaching of K-12 students.”*

#### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

Review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty, college supervisors, and cooperating teacher indicate that candidates have multiple opportunities to develop a range of pedagogical instruction skills while teaching and assessing student progress toward meeting state content standards. Faculty and candidates indicate both the modeling of and opportunities for candidates to practice a range of pedagogical instructional strategies in both coursework and field placements throughout the program. In interviews, college supervisors and cooperating teachers indicated that candidates consistently demonstrate the ability to incorporate a range of pedagogical strategies in instructional planning, delivery, and assessment in classrooms with diverse student populations.

As indicated in the Re-Visit Teams Findings for Common Standard 8, in fall 2010 the SDCC Teacher Credential Program implemented a workshop to formalize supervisor training. College supervisors are invited each semester to the student teaching orientation. The orientation, which includes student teachers and cooperating teachers, provides a detailed review of: SDCC program design; handbooks and forms, including assessments; roles and responsibilities; and contact information for each individual involved in the student teaching process. In addition to the group orientation, a separate orientation is held to orient each group (student teachers, cooperating teachers, college supervisors) to their specific roles and responsibilities.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

#### **Program Standard #2 – Collaboration in Governing the Program**

*Conversations with advisory committee members indicated that they are not being asked to “contribute substantively to the quality and effectiveness of the design and implementation of candidate preparation.”*

*Conversations with advisory committee members revealed that participants have not had the opportunity to “establish and review the terms and agreements of partnerships, including (a) partners’ well-defined roles, responsibilities and relationships.”*

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

As stated in the Re-Visit Teams Findings for Common Standard 1, interviews with Advisory Committee members indicate that the reformulated Advisory Committee is actively involved in reviewing the “quality and effectiveness of the design and implementation of” the SDCC credential program and that recommendations and decisions of the committee have been implemented by the program. Committee minutes and interviews indicate that discussion included reviewing partnership parameters.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

### **Program Standard #4 – Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice**

*The standardization of the clinical lesson plan and coursework limits a candidates ability to “evaluate instructional alternatives...and to try out alternative approaches to planning, managing and delivering instruction”.*

*Candidates reports that the academic content standards are posted and listed on every assignment and unit but the team was unable to find evidence that the program systematically ensures that all candidates “learn to assess instructional practices in relation to state-adopted ...curriculum frameworks...and the observed effects of different practices”*

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

Interviews with faculty indicate a programmatic rationale for use of a standardized clinical lesson plan format to provide candidates with a framework for creating instructional plans that consistently address academic content standards linked to lesson goals, content specific instructional strategies, selection of differentiated instruction to meet specific student needs, planned assessment to measure learning outcomes, and the use of assessment analysis to plan next steps in the instructional cycle. Interviews with candidates in student teaching placements indicated they found the clinical lesson plan provided a foundation on which to build as they expanded their planning to meet the needs of P12 students in their individual classrooms.

Review of course syllabi and field placement forms as well as interviews with candidates, faculty, and cooperating teachers indicate both an understanding and use of academic content standards in by candidates’ instructional practice both in course assignments and in student teaching placements.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

### **Program Standard #7a – Preparation to Teach Multiple Subject Reading-Language Arts**

*A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed that there are limited opportunities for candidates to systematically experience the skills necessary “to apply the State*

*Board of Education (SBE)-adopted core instructional materials for the instruction and assessment of ... writing, listening, and speaking.”*

*A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed there is inconsistent evidence that candidates “...demonstrate knowledge of how to organize and manage differentiated reading instruction to meet the needs of the full range of learners.”*

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

A review of syllabi and interviews with faculty and candidates indicate that candidates have a range of opportunities to experience the skills to use “core instructional materials for the instruction and assessment of...writing, listening, and speaking.” Course assignments purposefully build upon each other as the program progresses allowing candidates to experience, develop and then apply skills with diverse students in classroom settings. The signature assignment in the Elementary Reading course requires candidates use state adopted instructional materials in the assessment and instruction of the literacy skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking) of an below grade level reader. A review of syllabi and interviews with faculty and candidates indicate that candidates have a range of opportunities to demonstrate knowledge of how to organize and manage differentiated reading instruction to meet the needs of a full range of learners throughout course work and field work placements during the program.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

### **Program Standard #7b – Preparation to Teach Single Subject Reading-Language Arts**

*A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed that there was limited evidence that candidates were required to “...utilize content-based literacy strategies to facilitate learning of subject matter for the full range of learners in the classroom.”*

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

Review of syllabi and interviews with faculty, cooperating teachers, subject specific specialist, and candidates indicate that candidates are required to use content-based literacy strategies to facilitate subject matter content instruction for a full range of learners. Interviews indicated that candidates were using a range of strategies learned in the program in meeting the literacy needs of diverse learners. This was accomplished throughout coursework, especially in the single subject reading course, their subject specific pedagogy tutorial and student teaching placements. Candidates indicated a range of content-based strategies learned including pre-reading techniques, use of graphic organizers, visual aids, vocabulary development strategies, and a range of scaffolding techniques to support both literacy and content knowledge development.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

### **Program Standard #13 – Preparation to Teach English Learners**

*A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed that there was inconsistent evidence that candidates were provided systematic opportunities to support students' "...development of the academic language, comprehension and knowledge in the subjects of the core curriculum" or to "...promote students' access to and achievement in the state-adopted academic content standards."*

#### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

A review of syllabi and interviews with faculty and candidates indicate that candidates are provided systematic opportunities to support English Language learners in developing academic language and academic content knowledge. Across courses and especially in the TESOL/multicultural course and during field placements, candidates are required to plan and implement lessons and assessments using a range of state and district language assessment tools (including CELDT) to provide opportunities for English Language learners to meet state academic content standards. Further, candidates demonstrate their competency in Teaching Performance Assessment tasks.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

### **Program Standard #14 – Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Class**

*A review of course syllabi and interviews with faculty revealed that there was inconsistent evidence that candidates were provided opportunities to "...demonstrate basic skill in the use of differentiated instructional strategies that, to the degree possible, ensure that all students have access to the core curriculum" or to "...demonstrate the ability to create a positive, inclusive climate of instruction for all special populations in the general classroom."*

#### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

A review syllabi and interviews with faculty and candidates indicate that candidates are provided systematic opportunities to demonstrate basic skills in the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of special populations in the general classroom. Across courses and during field placements, candidates are required to plan and implement lessons and assessments based on state and district assessments (including IEP, 509, etc.) to provide an inclusive environment in which special populations have access to the core curriculum in general classrooms. Further, candidates demonstrate their competency in Teaching Performance Assessment tasks.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

#### **Program Standard #15 – Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork**

*Document reviews and interviews with faculty, college and district-employed supervisors revealed that the limited supervisor training resulted in the program minimally and inconsistently providing “...carefully planned, substantive field experiences in public schools ... that extend candidates’ understanding of major ideas and emphases developed in program and/or prerequisite coursework.”*

#### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

Details of the training provided by the program to field supervisors were described in the Common Standards 4 and 8 portions of the report. The training program is previously described in the revisit team findings to the response to Stipulation #2 and the responses to Common Standards 4 and 8.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

#### **Program Standard #16 – Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors**

*Document reviews and interviews with faculty, college and district-employed supervisors revealed that the limited supervisor training did not provide “...for their role-specific orientation and preparation; [or to] communicate with [district-employed supervisors] about responsibilities, rights, and expectations pertaining to candidates and supervisors.”*

#### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

Details of the training provided by the program to field supervisors are described in revisit team findings for Stipulation #2 and Common Standard 4 and 8.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.

## **2010 Team Findings - Standards Not Met:**

### **Program Standard #8A and 8B – Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction by Multiple and Single Subject Candidates**

*Document reviews and interviews with faculty, candidates, site administrators, and graduates revealed that the program minimally prepares candidates to “...to plan and deliver content-specific instruction consistent with state adopted academic content standards for students and curriculum framework... [or to] apply Teaching Performance Expectations to the teaching of each major subject area... [or to] learn and use specific pedagogical knowledge and skills that comprise the subject-specific TPEs for multiple subject candidates...” to ensure that candidates will be able to “...plan and implement instruction that fosters student achievement of the state-adopted academic content standards for students, using appropriate instructional strategies and materials.”*

### **2011 Re-Visit Team Finding**

Standard 8A/Multiple Subject Candidates: Review of program documents (syllabi, handbooks, assessment rubrics, field placement forms, etc.) as well as interviews with faculty, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, site administrators, graduates, and candidates indicate that Multiple Subject candidates are thoroughly prepared to plan, deliver, and assess content specific instruction consistent with the state adopted content standards and frameworks to diverse P8 students. Course goals/learning outcomes, as well as field placement forms, are linked to the Teaching Performance Expectations

Standard 8B/Single Subject Candidates: Review of program documents (syllabi, handbooks, assessment rubrics, field placement forms, etc.) as well as interviews with faculty, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, site administrators, graduates, and candidates indicate that Single Subject candidates are thoroughly prepared to plan, deliver, and assess content specific instruction consistent with the state adopted content standards and frameworks to diverse P12 students. Course goals/learning outcomes, as well as field placement forms, are linked to the Teaching Performance Expectations

To provide Single Subject candidates with more specific instruction and mentoring in their subject content area, an individualized 50 hour placement with an identified subject specific specialist was developed. An MOU with subject specific specialist set out the expectations for the experience. Candidates completed 4 assignments focused on tutoring an individual student, working with small groups, developing and teaching a lesson, and working with English Language Learners in their content area. Subject specific specialists and single subject candidates indicated in interviews that this placement provided opportunities for learning and applying subject specific methodologies across the content spectrum and with diverse students at all academic levels. Candidates indicated the experience provided a solid foundation for entering full-time student teaching.

After a review of the comments made by the review team last year and a careful review of the issues identified during the last visit, the team found sufficient evidence to determine that the institution meets the standard.